



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22317-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,831	11/09/2001	Dennis E. Ferguson	57005US002	3089

32692 7590 10/08/2003

3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY
PO BOX 33427
ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427

EXAMINER

KUHNS, ALLAN R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1732

DATE MAILED: 10/08/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
16/005,831Applicant(s)
FERGUSON ET AL.Examiner
KUHNGroup Art Unit
1732

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE (3) MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-8, 10-15, 17-21 AND 25-27 is/are rejected.
- ☒ Claim(s) 4, 9, 16 AND 22-24 is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 6
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1732

1. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This claim is indefinite because “the molded elastomer” lacks antecedent basis within the claims. Clarification is required.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-15, 17-21 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooke et al. (6,558,496) in view of Yotsutsuji et al. Brooke et al. disclose or suggest the basic claimed method of making a polymeric molded article including electroforming a plating onto a first surface of a prototype article, wherein the first surface is defined in part by an arrangement of fine topography features (note Fig. 9), so that the plating defines an article mold having a reverse image arrangement of the topography features. Note column 3, lines 34-37 with respect to electroforming. Brooke et al. appear not to explicitly state that the surface or the prototype is or should be electrically conductive, but such is taught by Yotsutsuji et al. at column 5, lines 3-11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate this feature taught by Yotsutsuji et al. into the method of Brooke et al. in order to facilitate the electroforming step.

Art Unit: 1732

Brooke et al. disclose the forming of a polyurethane material at column 5, lines 44, a material which is subject to curing, as in claim 1, and it is submitted that the material must flow into the fine topography features of the reverse image arrangement, as in claim 1, in order to form a proper copy. Figure 9 of Brooke et al. illustrates stems or projections and topography in the manner of claims 3, 5-7, 11-12, 14, 17-20 and 27. Polyurethane is produced in elastomeric form, as in claim 2. Forming two or more part molds, as in claims 13 and 21, is well known and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in order to facilitate article removal. Verifying the efficacy of a system, as in claims 10 and 15, is also well known and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in order to ensure the success of the electroforming process.

4. Claims 4, 9, 16 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allan Kuhns whose telephone number is (703) 308-3462. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni, can be reached on (703) 305-5493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/005,831

Page 4

Art Unit: 1732

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Allan R. Kuhns

ALLAN R. KUHNS
PRIMARY EXAMINER AU 1732

9-30-03